

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- June 26, 1984
7:30 p.m. - 9:33 p.m.

\$

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ross Transmeier at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Susan Rush	Mike Dooley
Miland Dunivent	Bill O'Dwyer
Ross Transmeier, Chairman	Warren Stephens

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was:

Bob Goldin

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 36 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS: THAT SUSAN'S LAST NAME, MISPELLED ON PAGE ONE UNDER THOSE ATTENDING FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION, BE SPELLED CORRECTLY AS RUSH; ALSO ON PAGE TWO, 7TH SENTENCE FROM THE BOTTOM, THAT MAIN STREET BE CORRECTED TO READ 9TH STREET."

Miland Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III FULL HEARING

1. #17-84 REZONE RSF-4 TO PR-4 AND NORTHRIDGE ESTATES FILING #4 OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Northridge Estates, Inc./Joseph C. Coleman
Location: East of 1st Street, north of F Road, south of F.5
Road, and west of 7th Street.

A request to change from residential single family uses at 4 units per acre to planned residential uses at 4 units per acre and an outline development plan of 96 units on 28.1 acres.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Joseph Coleman presented an overview of the project and stated that the project had been brought to the Commission/Council in 1983 and been solely single family. The request at this point was the incorporation of townhomes. The only other significant change to the original plan was to be the proposed inclusion of a 2.5 acre park located near the intersection of 1st Street and Patterson Road. He stated that there would be no townhomes bordering the existing Northridge lots.

The following responses were given to review agency comments:

Parks: In order to obtain the 2.5 acre tract used for a park, a proposal of a land exchange with the City (one acre for one acre) was made. The portion nearest the canal, south of the entrance to the property, would be used as an "unconventional" park area such as Lilac Park. The majority of this 2.5 acres would, however, be used to establish traditional park facilities.

Access: Maps were shown outlining various alternatives to access. The desired access was omitted from these maps but is located midpoint between F Road and where Horizon Drive was to have come through. It was felt that the building of a bridge into Northacres was not justified. The same opposing feelings were presented with relation to the proposed alternate bridge into Willowbrook. It was also felt that item #16-84 presented a conflict in access to this project.

Other Comments: Other questions brought up by review agencies concerning fire protection, etc. would be addressed and complied with. These items had not yet been considered in the ODP status. A letter had been received from Victor Daniels, an adjacent property owner, expressing concern over the proposed access point. It was brought out that a North Bluff vacation was sought in order to provide more space for the park proposal.

Horizon Drive: This proposal openly acknowledged the denial of the Horizon Drive extension and was designed with this denial in mind. Also, this property was owned by private individuals and

those individuals should have a say in how their property is to be developed.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush wished to clarify the type of access problem which would be present should the retirement project be approved. She asked if a revision of the plan and a relocation of the townhomes would be a problem.

Mr. Coleman stated that the reason they did not tie into the retirement project's right-of-way was that tying into a four-laned Horizon Drive was not desired. What they wanted was to tie their road into a standard, subdivision grade road, and if the retirement project could revise their plan to show this, Mr. Coleman stated that they would revise the townhome layout to accommodate the other project.

Commissioner Rush asked if Mr. Coleman would consider sharing the cost of such a road with the other project's petitioners.

Mr. Coleman said that the way it stands now, the proposed retirement project would only have to pay for the last two or three acres of road in their project and the remaining costs would be borne by the Northridge Estates petitioners since the majority of this road would be running through their project. He said that Northridge Filing #4 would build a road from 1st Street east to their property line, and the retirement residence continuing on to 7th Street. He felt that making the property line the dividing line was a standard procedure.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin felt that the areas of contention were fairly well covered by the petitioner. He stated, however, that the Parks Department was not willing to accept the park dedication in-lieu of the open space fee. The review agencies felt that the Knollridge Drive to the north should be considered a separate issue and should not be tied into Northridge Estates Filing #4.

Bob stated that the City would be willing to negotiate on the additional access to 7th Street. The closure of Willowbrook Drive is still being planned, but who will be responsible for this is still unclear. Concerning private drives, it was requested that these be made to conform to city standards. With reference to North Bluff Drive, this would be referred to legal council for a recommendation. Regarding the trade of land with the City, this would be a decision made by City Council, however, if this land was considered surplus, it would be subject to a bidding process.

Bob concluded that, with regard to Horizon Drive, it was unclear as to whether the Horizon Drive extension was actually cancelled or merely postponed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Victor Daniels, acting as representative for his parents who own lot 2 of North Bluff Subdivision, stated that back in 1977 access to this particular lot had been in question when it was thought Horizon Drive would be extended. Currently, it is accessed only by North Bluff Drive, but felt that this drive was exceptionally wide. He felt that the vacation of the North Bluff Drive would be acceptable if an alternate access (of a more reasonable width) could be furnish either due east or south of what is presently Northridge Drive. He was concerned that a landlock of this property be avoided.

Mr. Coleman replied that adequate access to Mr. Daniels' father's property would be provided from either Northridge Filing #4 or North Bluff Drive. He would work with Mr. Daniels to ensure adequate access.

Joan Razer, a Northridge resident, voiced her approval over a park in this area. She felt that the Horizon Drive issue was, in fact, cancelled and passed out copies of the Daily Sentinel article which stated this to the Commission members. She felt that this question should not be used to hold up the developers.

William Putnam, a Northridge resident, thought that this area had once been designated as a greenbelt area.

Lincoln Hall, President of the Northridge Homeowners' Association, also felt that the Horizon Drive extension issue was "dead." A main concern was for a second access. He was also in favor of additional parklands. When asked by Chairman Transmeier if the Homeowners' Association would be responsible for up-keep of this park if approved, Mr. Hall responded felt that might be a possibility with a property assessment or volunteer assistance from various individuals.

Mike Sutherland, City Zoning Enforcement Officer and acting as a private resident, felt that monies from the Parks Department should be spent on maintaining currently existing parks. If residents agreed to maintain this proposed park, this would be acceptable.

IN OPPOSITION:

Sharon Gordon, a Northridge resident, felt that this area should be kept in single family zoning. Chairman Transmeier told Ms. Gordon that although the petitioners were asking for a high

density rezone, the actual request was the lowest figure in a high density area.

Mildred Vandover expressed her concern over the second access and thought the Commission should still consider the question of the Horizon Drive extension as viable. She did not understand why, in the present Grand Junction economy, the petitioners wanted to build additional housing.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Coleman responded to Bob Goldin's comments saying that they would comply with the current regulations on private drives. He felt that the zoning which was requested was relatively low. Mr. Coleman felt that other individuals who did not own the land in question should not be given the right to decide how it should be developed.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens asked if the park proposal was approved and the Homeowners' Association did agree to maintain the park, would the costs be borne solely by residents of filing #4?

Mr. Coleman stated that he would approach the Northridge residents on this proposal. He felt that a special improvement district may be imposed on this area to support the park.

Commissioner Transmeier asked Bob Goldin if filing #4 had been filed before this last ODP.

Bob answered that filings #1, #2, and #3 were the original filings and that #4 had not been considered.

LaBrille Carsons spoke out from the audience saying that the proposed access would traverse property owned by her. She expressed concern over this.

Mr. Coleman answered Ms. Carsons' concern saying that the proposed access which she had referred to was a city alternative and not one proposed by him.

Chairman Transmeier stated that the access which Ms. Carsons referred to was a public right-of-way currently there.

Bob Goldin stated that although this was an outline development plan, the outcome of this hearing would affect the final plan concerning major issues, i.e. parklands, private drives, Horizon Drive, and various technical issues.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DOOLEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF #17-84 IN THE MATTER OF REZONE, I MOVE THAT THE CONSIDERATION OF REZONE FROM RSF-4 TO PR-4 BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DOOLEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN CASE OF #17-84 CONSIDERATION OF THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONTINGENCIES: 1) THAT THERE BE NO PRIVATE DRIVES ALLOWED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PRIVATE DRIVES ACCESSING THE TWO LANDLOCKED PARCELS (JONES AND DANIELS), 2) THAT THERE BE A SECOND ACCESS PROVIDED OUT OF FILING #4 TOWARDS 7TH STREET, 3) THAT RECOMMENDATION BE MADE TO THE PARKS DEPARTMENT TO ACCEPT THE 5% FEE IN-LIEU OF THE PARK OFFERED BY THE DEVELOPER, AND 4) THAT THE WILLOWBROOK BRIDGE NOT BEING BUILT AT THE DEVELOPER'S EXPENSE."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A discussion followed on the motion concerning the acceptance or denial of the Horizon Drive extension. Commissioner Dooley felt that by the passage of this motion, the Commission would be, in essence, acknowledging the denial of the extension and that the City Council would need to address consideration of this project in that light. Commissioner Rush expressed her concern over the addressing of the land swap question, that clarification be made to the homeowners who would consider maintaining this park. Chairman Transmeier clarified the point that the City has chosen to accept the fee in-lieu of the proposed park.

Chairman Transmeier clarified that the two driveways to the landlocked parcels are not included in those earlier discussed as being brought up to city standards. Those are considered private drives. Those needing to meet city standards are those drives proposed around the townhouses.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1 with Commissioner Rush opposing.

**2. #16-84 REZONE RSF-4 TO PR/GRAND JUNCTION RETIREMENT
RESIDENCE - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Petitioner: Alfred B. Carrick

Location: Approximately 1,000 feet north of F Road and west of
7th Street.

A request to change from residential single family uses at 4
units per acre to planned residential and an outline development
plan on 3.65 acres (101 retirement units).

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Clifford Curry, representing the petitioner, began by providing
an overview of the project. He felt that there might be some
question on the zoning since there is no project of this type in
the area. It possessed both single family and multi-family
characteristics. Mr. Curry felt that one of the major concerns
was that of access. He felt that the project was certainly
flexible with regard to access, and expressed a desire to begin
the project sometime this summer. They have also presented
alternate access proposals.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked how this project was to be
marketed.

Mr. Curry responded saying that this project would be privately
financed on a month-to-month rental by residents. A resident
would typically reside in the project for a period of 5 years.
This project is designed primarily for those persons who are
already in the area.

Commissioner Dooley asked if this project would be increased in
size later on.

Mr. Curry stated that the figure of 101 units was desired by them
and that there were no intentions of expanding.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if nursing or medical facilities would
be provided.

Mr. Curry answered negatively.

Commissioner Stephens asked that, in the event that Horizon Drive
did not go through, would there be any requirement of the parcel
previously in question by the former petitioners?

Mr. Curry stated that the project was acceptable as is without
the trade of any additional land. He merely presented this
alternative as an option for the City.

Commissioner Dunivent asked if he could foresee any problems of access with the adjacent west property owners.

Mr. Curry again reaffirmed the project's flexibility. He felt that any question which may arise could certainly be worked out to the satisfaction of all parties.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin felt that the density question had not been dealt with because of the unique nature of the project. From the perspective of 101 units on 3.65 acres, it worked out to be equivalent to a PR-28 zoning. He expressed a preference to keep a business zoning out of the area, and thought that the PR-28 would be most acceptable with an explanation (or definition) of the zoning.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dooley asked if this would go to City Council as a PR.

Bob responded by saying that it could and that the City Council could give it a designed density. However, he felt that the PR-28 would be the most realistic. Bob pointed out that Horizon Towers at 34.5 units/acre had already set some type of precedent for the area.

Commissioner Dooley asked if this area could merely be zoned a PR with the stipulation that it not exceed 28 units per acre.

Bob thought that perhaps the legal staff could investigate this possibility, but the area would eventually need some type of density designation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

William Coleson, also acting as a representative for the petitioner, gave a favorable overview of the project in relation to similar projects which had been constructed.

IN OPPOSITION:

Sharon Gordon felt that the Horizon Towers project was offensive and felt that the skyline in her area would be obstructed in both directions should this project be approved. With both file #'s 16-84 and #17-84 approved, she felt that the 7th and Patterson area would be highly impacted.

Joseph Coleman, representative of the former #17-84 project, expressed concern over the need for a site specific plan. He felt that more details concerning architecture, landscaping, etc. should be received. Also, he felt that since approval of his project was made, a consistency should be maintained with this project and alter plans to exclude the extension of Horizon Drive.

Chairman Transmeier asked Mr. Coleman if the Commission was willing to accept the proposed access between the Grand Valley Canal and the Independent Ranchman's Ditch, would he be willing to share costs in building that road with the current petitioners?

Mr. Coleman understood that the current petitioners had access through to 7th Street and their proposal was to provide access from 1st Street through to the eastern boundary and the current petitioners providing access from 7th Street through to their west boundary. These two roads would meet and the City would get this road at no cost.

Chairman Transmeier felt that the current petitioners would have no reason to build this access as Mr. Coleman had stated--that it would not be to their benefit.

Mr. Coleman again stated that if the current petitioners did maintain their present plan, that this would conflict with his project and he would reaffirm objection. He requested that some revision of the current petitioner's plan be made to accommodate the denial of the Horizon Drive extension and thus, accommodate his project. Mr. Coleman felt also, that by approval of this project as a PR-28, it would be inconsistent with the surrounding area and the PR-4 which he had requested.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Curry felt that compliance to a specific landscape design would not be a problem. He reaffirmed flexibility on access and said that access on 7th Street would be fine at any point which created the least problem for everyone involved.

Chairman Transmeier asked how many vehicles would be owned by residents.

Mr. Curry replied that approximately 10% of the residents would own cars. Typically, they may start out with a vehicle, but several months later after non-use of the vehicle, turn around and sell it.

Commissioner Dooley requested the number of staff vehicles present.

Mr. Curry responded by saying that, in addition to the one project vehicle, there would be a maximum of 8 additional vehicles for the staff.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #16-84 REZONE RSF-4 TO PR-29, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

A discussion ensued after this motion was made on how the determination of a PR-29 zone designation was arrived upon. Bob Goldin advised the Commissioners that though there were several options available for arriving at a zone designation, he felt that by dividing the number of units by the total acreage, it would equal a figure somewhat over 28 units per acre. A PR-29 designation would accommodate this overage. Commissioner O'Dwyer agreed with this determination and the motion was amended accordingly.

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #16-84 OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON THAT THERE BE NO LAND TRADES AND REORIENT THE SITE PLAN TO ACCOMMODATE THE ACCESS OUTSIDE OF AND WITH NO CONSIDERATION FOR HORIZON DRIVE."

Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion.

A discussion of the motion followed concerning clarification of the access question. The motion was amended accordingly.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.